

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,195	09/04/2001	Kazuhiro Asada	110540	1204
25944 759	90 06/18/2004		EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			WOOD, KEVIN S	
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2874	
			DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/944,195	ASADA, KAZUHIRO				
riavioury riolion	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Kevin S Wood	2874				
Th MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cov r sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 02 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearance (1) a timely filed Notice of Appearance (1) a timely filed Notice of Appearance (1) and the compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application in the second	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened at the contraction of the contracti	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
(b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's						
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	· ·	see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note to						
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	etion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>		sidered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). <u>6</u>	<u>6/2/04</u> .				
10. Other:	Brian Healy Heel					
	Primary Examiner	ve				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments presented in the Request For Reconsideration filed on 2 June 2004 have been thoroughly reviewed by the examiner. The examiner believes the cited reference(s) to reasonably and properly meet all the limitations of the claimed invention.

Brian Healy

Primary Examiner